

REMARKS

No Claims have been amended.

Claims 1-23 and 25 have been cancelled.

Claim 24 is currently pending in this application.

Claim 24 is in independent format.

1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

All claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) have been cancelled.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In response to Applicant's amendment of 8/23/04, the Examiner issued the Final Office Action of 7/25/05, in which the Examiner provided a responsive statement to Applicant's arguments directed towards Claim 1 and U.S. 6,085,428 *Casby et al.* reference. The Examiner did not provide further additional detailed rejection of the remaining claims, other than a summation statement that the "rejection of the remaining claims 2-25 are maintained for the same reasons as stated above," referring to the '428 *Casby et al.* discussion.

However, Claim 24, was never rejected on the basis of the '428 *Casby et al.* reference. Rather, it was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,556,971 to *Rigsby et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,309 to *Attias*. Applicant amended Claim 24 to distinguish over these references by the amendment of 8/23/04, and accordingly, the Examiner's reiteration of the same rejections and comments directed to the '428 *Casby et al.* reference do not appear to respond to the Applicant's amendments. As such, Applicant is respectfully requesting the Examiner to specifically respond to Applicant's amendments and arguments

associated with Claim 24, restated generally below, or to allow Claim 24 in the previously amended form.

a. Claim 24

The rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,556,971 to *Rigsby et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,309 to *Attias* is respectfully traversed.

The '971 *Rigsby et al.* reference is directed towards a method for training a speech recognition system to identify operator spoken commands. The '971 *Rigsby et al.* reference is implemented in one embodiment with a vehicle service system (Fig. 6) having a speech processing unit 658 and a main central processing unit 668. Voice audio signals are processed and parsed by the speech processing unit 658 to identify corresponding digital commands for communication to the main CPU 668. (Col. 9, lines 44-48). The Examiner cites the '309 *Attias* reference as teaching the additional step of clarifying a portion of an audio signal representative of a voice audio command by utilizing at least one additional audio signal such as the technique of blind source separation.

Amendments to Claim 24 set forth in Applicant's Amendment of 8/23/04 were intended to clarify and better set forth the claimed method. The amended method of Claim 24 requires communicating only the clarified portions of audio signals representative of voice commands to software resident in the central processing unit of a vehicle wheel alignment system. The clarified portions of the audio signals, i.e. those containing the spoken commands, are then processed by the software module at the central processing unit to identify discrete spoken commands contained within the

audio signals, eliminating the step of pre-processing or parsing of the audio signals in a separate speech processor as taught by the '971 *Rigsby et al.* reference.

Accordingly, the combination of the '971 *Rigsby et al.* and '309 *Attias* references fails to teach or suggest all of the required steps of method Claim 24, and as such, Claim 24 is believed allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

b. Claims 6

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

c. Claim 25

Claim 25 has been cancelled.

d. Claim 2

Claim 2 has been cancelled.

e. Claim 8

Claim 8 has been cancelled.

f. Claim 10

Claim 10 has been cancelled.

g. Claim 13

Claim 13 has been cancelled.

h. Claim 14

Claim 14 has been cancelled.

i. Claim 16

Claim 16 has been cancelled.

j. Claim 22

Claim 22 has been cancelled.

k. Claim 9

Claim 9 has been cancelled.

l. Claim 11

Claim 11 has been cancelled.

m. Claim 15


Claim 15 has been cancelled.

3. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the allowance of claim 24 is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Books, Reg. No. 40,918
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Tel: (314) 238-2400
Fax: (314) 238-2401
mbooks@patpro.com